## REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed December 16, 2003 in which claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected, and claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20 were objected to. With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15, and 16 have been amended and claims 21-30 have been added. Claims 1-30, therefore, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,453,068 to Li.

With this Amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that if the target pixel value is less than the minimum value, then the method includes increasing the target pixel value and reducing at least one of the neighbor pixel values, and clarify that if the target pixel value is greater than the maximum value, then the method includes reducing the target pixel value and increasing at least one of the neighbor pixel values. In addition, independent claim 8 has been amended to clarify that the pixel adjustment circuitry is configured to reduce at least one of the neighbor pixel values in response to increasing the target pixel value and increase at least one of the neighbor pixel values in response to reducing the target pixel value, and independent claim 15 has been amended to clarify that the pixel processing control instructions are configured to direct the processor to reduce at least one of the neighbor pixel values in response to increasing the target pixel value, and increase at least one of the neighbor pixel values in response to reducing the target pixel value.

With respect to the Li patent, this patent does not teach or suggest a method of operating a pixel processing system, as claimed in amended independent claim 1, nor a pixel processing system, as claimed in amended independent claim 8, nor a product for pixel processing, as claimed in amended independent claim 15.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are patentably distinct from the Li patent and, therefore, are in a condition for allowance. Furthermore, as dependent claims 21-23 further define patentably distinct claim 1, dependent claims 24-26 further define patentably distinct claim 8, and dependent claims 27-29 further

9

define patentably distinct claim 15, Applicant submits that dependent claims 21-23, 24-26, and 27-29 are also in a condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claims 1, 8, 15, 21-23, 24-26, and 27-29 be allowed.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With this Amendment, allowable claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 1) and any intervening claims (none). As rewritten claim 2 is now believed to be in allowable form, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 3-7 are allowable in dependent form. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the objection to claims 2-7 be withdrawn and that claims 2-7 be allowed.

With this Amendment, allowable claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 8) and any intervening claims (none). As rewritten claim 9 is now believed to be in allowable form, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 10-14 are allowable in dependent form. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the objection to claims 9-14 be withdrawn and that claims 9-14 be allowed.

With this Amendment, allowable claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 15) and any intervening claims (none). As rewritten claim 16 is now believed to be in allowable form, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 17-20 are allowable in dependent form. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the objection to claims 16-20 be withdrawn and that claims 16-20 be allowed.

Amendment and Response
Applicant: Brent M. Bradburn
Serial No.: 09/753,170
Filed: January 2, 2001
Docket No.: 10002892-1
Title: PIXEL PROCESSING SYSTEM FOR IMAGE PRODUCTION

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-30 are all in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Larry D. Baker at Telephone No. (360) 212-0769, Facsimile No. (858) 655-5859 or Scott A. Lund at Telephone No. (612) 573-2006, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Hewlett-Packard Company**
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Brent M. Bradburn,

By his attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2006
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: _____ March 2, 2004
SAL:jan

Scott A. Lund
Reg. No. 41,166

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) 872-9306 on this __2ND__ day of March, 2004.

By
Name: Scott A. Lund

11